

REMARKS

In the present Amendment, Claim 2 and 17 have been amended to recite that --the dynamic frictional force between an image-receiving surface on the image-receiving sheet and a back surface on the opposite side thereof is 50 gf to 120 gf--. This amendment is supported by the specification, for example, at page 23, last full paragraph.

No new matter has been added and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the Amendment, Claims 2, 3 and 17 will be all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claim 3

In the Office Action Summary, the Examiner indicates that “Claim 3 has been objected to.”

Applicants wish to point out that Claim 3 is not included in the only rejection and that there is no objection in the Detailed Action. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection.

II. Priority Claim

The Examiner has not acknowledged Applicants’ claim for foreign priority or indicated receipt of the copies of the priority documents submitted in the parent Appln. No. 10/060,170.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to make such acknowledgement in the next PTO communication.

III. Drawings

The Examiner has not indicated whether the drawings filed with the application on March 30, 2004, have been accepted.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge acceptance of the drawings in the next PTO communication.

IV. Response to Double Patenting Rejection

In Paragraph No. 2 of the Office Action, Claims 2 and 17 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over “Claims 1, 11 and 3” of Wachi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,800,589).

Applicants believe that “Claims 1, 11 and 3” is meant to be “Claims 1, 11 and 13.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are patentable over the claims of Wachi et al for at least the following reasons.

Claim 11 of Wachi et al discloses an image-forming material wherein the dynamic frictional force in relation to an image-receiving surface and a back surface of 40 gf or less. Claims 1 and 13 of Wachi et al do not disclose or suggest this feature. The range of *40 gf or less* recited in Claim 11 of Wachi et al clearly falls outside the range of *50 gf to 120 gf* recited in present Claims 2 and 17. That is, the claims of Wachi et al teach away from the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are not obvious over the claims of Wachi et al and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 10/811,967

Attorney Docket Q80843

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Fang Liu
Registration No. 51,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 14, 2005